

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1 and 3 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

The Examiner objects to Figure 1 of the Drawings because it is not labeled "prior art." The Examiner suggests that the two memory areas of Figure 2 should be shown as parts of a single memory device as claimed in claim 2.

Responsive to these objections to the Drawings, filed herewith are replacement sheets correcting the Drawings. Applicant notes that Figure 2 shows a "Memory Device" that contains Memory 11 and Memory 12, according to an embodiment of the invention. The Examiner is respectfully requested to review and to approve the Drawings.

Formal Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging review and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed April 9, 2004.

However, the Examiner did not acknowledge review and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed February 19, 2002. The Examiner is **again respectfully requested to review and to consider these references** and to acknowledge same. The relevance of these references was described in the Specification (pages 1-3).

Rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Qua et al U.S. Patent No. 6,222,909. This rejection is traversed.

Among the problems recognized and solved by Applicant's claimed invention is that sometimes a user may wish to replay or reproduce a conversation previously recorded by a mobile telephone while a current conversation is being recorded. According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention more than one memory (or more than one memory areas of a single memory device) are provided so that while conversation contents previously recorded on a first memory are reproduced, a second memory can record the current conversation content.

For at least the following reasons, Applicant's claimed invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious from Qua. By way of example, independent claim 1 requires reproducing the conversation content which the first memory recorded, while the second memory records the conversation contents of the current conversation.

Qua discloses an audio note taking system for communication devices in which notes are recorded by one party during a conversation and may be transmitted to other parties (Qua, Abstract). In particular, Qua discloses that audio notes taken during a conversation on a telephone communication device may be distributed to others in a number of different formats, such as via an interface with other communication systems, for example voice servers, e-mail servers, and personal computers, in order to distribute the stored audio information in an accurate and comprehensive manner (Qua, col. 1, lines 39-49); that users can replay previously recorded notes during a current call, and that a

user can direct retrieval of audio information for playback on the communication device (Qua, col. 2, lines 1-5); that once a call has been established between a user and destination parties, the user may initiate a recording process via an activation sequence which may entail the depression of one or more keys for taking audio notes (Qua, col. 4 lines 8-15); and that comments of the user may be intermingled with the actual conversation to create an annotated recorded message (Qua, col. 5, lines 1-3).

Qua does not disclose or suggest reproducing a previously recorded conversation content while a current conversation is being recorded. Clearly, Qua does not disclose or suggest that a first memory reproduces a conversation content recorded, while the second memory records conversation contents of a current conversation, as *inter alia*, required by independent claim 1. Therefore, Qua does not disclose or suggest the recitation of independent claim 1.

In fact, Qua belongs to the prior art recognized by Applicant's claimed invention, because Qua does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed problems recognized and solved by Applicant's claimed invention.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent claim 1, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof. Therefore, claims 2 and 3 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have

any questions regarding this Amendment or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503

GB:eg

Encl. – 2 sheets of drawings